UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/758,262 | 01/16/2004 | Kevin Sullivan | JPC-011 D1 | 5705 |

70813 7590 02/10/2009
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LIVERSEDGE, JENNIFER L | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 3692 | |
| **NOTIFICATION DATE** | **DELIVERY MODE** |
| 02/10/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AAlpha-Kpetewama@goodwinprocter.com
patentdc@goodwinprocter.com

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/758,262 | SULLIVAN, KEVIN |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | JENNIFER LIVERSEDGE | 3692 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *37,40-45,47-50 and 53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *37,40-45,47-50 and 53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration of Application 10/758,262 filed on November 7, 2008.

The amendment contains previously presented claims: 40-43, 45 and 47-50.

The amendment contains amended claims: 37 and 44.

The amendment contains new claim: 53.

Claims 1-36, 38-39, 46 and 51-52 have been canceled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 37, 40-45, 47-50 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,070,153 to Simpson (further referred to as Simpson), in view of US Patent 6,631,358 B1 to Ogilvie (further referred to as Ogilvie), in view of US Patent 6,345,261 B1 to Feidelson et al. (further referred to as Feidelson), and further in view of Case Law – *in re Venner*.

Regarding claim 37, Simpson discloses a computerized method for implementation of multiple accounts, wherein the multiple accounts include at least one card payment instrument account from a card issuer and at least one investment account from a financial institution (columns 1-6), the method comprising:

Providing a card and investment application to an applicant, the card and investment applications entitling an approved cardholder to establish a card payment instrument account and an investment account (column 2, lines 32-49; column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 67);

Approving a submitted card and investment application through an application processor system (column 3, line 55 - column 4, line 37);

Establishing the card payment instrument account through the card issuer for the approved cardholder upon acceptance, wherein the card payment instrument account includes a reward feature available to the cardholder (Figures 1 and 3; column 1, lines 10-25 and lines 45-63; column 2, lines 30-39; column 3, line 50-column 4, line 53; column 5, lines 25-28; column 6, lines 19-26);

Creating the investment account for the approved cardholder through the financial institution upon approval (Figure 1; column 2, lines 30-39; column 3, line 50-column 4, line 53; column 6, lines 19-26);

Linking the card payment instrument account from the card issuer to the investment account from the financial institution (Figure 1; column 2, lines 30-41; column 4, lines 27-37; column 6, lines 19-27);

Establishing a reward structure through an agreement between the financial institution and the card issuer (column 1, lines 46-63; column 2, lines 9-11; column 5, lines 25-30);

Implementing the reward feature by tracking expenditures made through the card payment instrument account and calculating a monetary reward amount in relation to the tracked expenditures (Figure 3; column 1, lines 10-25 and lines 45-63; column 4, lines 45-53; column 5, lines 25-28);

Depositing the monetary reward amount generated by the reward feature into the investment account at a predetermined time interval (Figure 3; column 1, lines 45-63); and

Allowing independent funding of the investment account by the cardholder (Figures 1 and 3; column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 17-22; column 4, lines 13-19; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 5; column 5, lines 41-59).

Simpson does not disclose an investment fund card application enabling establishment of a card and an investment account. However, Ogilvie discloses where one application is used to both apply for and establish a credit card and an investment

vehicle based on the card use, wherein a single application is filled out for both the credit card and for designating a reward selection (column 1, lines 56-67). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the simultaneous accepting of credit card and investment fund account applications for the establishment of linked accounts as disclosed by Simpson to adapt the use of a single form for both accounts as disclosed by Ogilvie. The motivation would be that both accounts are set up using an individual's personal data and information, and establishing both accounts based on this one-time receipt of data enables an efficient and less error prone mechanism for opening linked accounts.

Neither Simpson nor Ogilvie disclose wherein the issued card payment instrument bears the name of the financial institution and the name of the card issuer. However, Feidelson discloses wherein the issued card payment instrument bears the name of the financial institution and the name of the card issuer (column 14, lines 38-42). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of a credit card wherein a reward feature is implemented through partnership with another organization using a single application as disclosed by Simpson and Ogilvie to adapt issuing a credit card that bears partnership organizations on the card as disclosed by Feidelson. The motivation would be that co-branding a credit card by including the names of participating organizations on the card, rather than just one organization in the partnership, builds customer use in using the card by providing visual queues as to the benefit of the using the card. When a user is preparing to pay for a purchase and opens their wallet and sees, for example, three

credit cards, the credit card with a visual reminder that using that card will result in a deposit into one's investment account based on the purchase value will inspire the purchaser to select that card for the purchase over a card which offers no specific and tangible reward. Building loyalty and encouraging use is the motivation behind the use of co-branded credit cards.

Neither Simpson, Ogilvie, nor Feidelson specifically disclose automatically creating the investment account for the approved cardholder. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have automated creating the account because it would have sped up the process of account creation particularly given that all of the data necessary for creating the investment account manually are known to each of Simpson, Ogilvie and Feidelson and the end result would have been the same as compared to the manual method. *In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 1209 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).*

Regarding claim 44, Simpson discloses a computerized method for establishing and implementing multiple accounts, wherein the multiple accounts include at least one card payment instrument account from a card issuer and at least one investment account from a financial institution (columns 1-6), the method comprising:

Simultaneously offering multiple accounts including the card payment instrument account through the card issuer and the investment account from the financial institution (column 2, lines 30-38; column 3 line 50-column 4, line 53; column 6, lines 19-26);

When a recipient of an offer for multiple accounts accepts the offer for multiple accounts, establishing the card payment instrument account in response to the acceptance, wherein the card payment instrument account includes a reward feature available to the recipient (Figures 1 and 3; column 1, lines 10-25 and lines 45-63; column 2, lines 30-39; column 3, line 50-column 4, line 53; column 5, lines 25-28; column 6, lines 19-26);

Creating the investment account after the acceptance upon notification provided to the financial institution to create the investment account upon establishment of the card payment instrument account by a card issuer computing system (Figure 1; column 2, lines 30-39; column 3, line 50-column 4, line 53; column 6, lines 19-26);

Establishing a reward structure through an agreement between the financial institution and the card issuer (column 1, lines 46-63; column 2, lines 9-11; column 5, lines 25-30);

Implementing the reward feature by tracking expenditures made through the card payment instrument account and calculating a monetary reward amount in relation to the tracked expenditures (Figure 3; column 1, lines 10-25 and lines 45-63; column 4, lines 45-53; column 5, lines 25-28); and

Depositing the monetary reward amount generated by the reward feature into the investment account at predetermined time intervals (Figure 3; column 1, lines 45-63).

Simpson does not disclose an investment fund card application enabling establishment of a card and an investment account. However, Ogilvie discloses where one application is used to both apply for and establish a credit card and an investment

vehicle based on the card use, wherein a single application is filled out for both the credit card and for designating a reward selection (column 1, lines 56-67). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the simultaneous accepting of credit card and investment fund account applications for the establishment of linked accounts as disclosed by Simpson to adapt the use of a single form for both accounts as disclosed by Ogilvie. The motivation would be that both accounts are set up using an individual's personal data and information, and establishing both accounts based on this one-time receipt of data enables an efficient and less error prone mechanism for opening linked accounts.

Neither Simpson nor Ogilvie disclose wherein the issued card payment instrument bears the name of the financial institution and the name of the card issuer. However, Feidelson discloses wherein the issued card payment instrument bears the name of the financial institution and the name of the card issuer (column 14, lines 38-42). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of a credit card wherein a reward feature is implemented through partnership with another organization through a single application as disclosed by Simpson to adapt issuing a credit card that bears partnership organizations on the card as disclosed by Feidelson. The motivation would be that co-branding a credit card by including the names of participating organizations on the card, rather than just one organization in the partnership, builds customer use in using the card by providing visual queues as to the benefit of the using the card. When a user is preparing to pay for a purchase and opens their wallet and sees, for example, three credit cards, the

credit card with a visual reminder that using that card will result in a deposit into one's investment account based on the purchase value will inspire the purchaser to select that card for the purchase over a card which offers no specific and tangible reward. Building loyalty and encouraging use is the motivation behind the use of co-branded credit cards.

Neither Simpson, Ogilvie nor Feidelson specifically disclose automatically creating the investment account for the approved cardholder. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have automated creating the account because it would have sped up the process of account creation particularly given that all of the data necessary for creating the investment account manually are known to each of Simpson, Ogilvie and Feidelson, and the end result would have been the same as compared to the manual method. *In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 1209 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).*

Regarding claim 45, Simpson discloses allowing independent funding of the investment account by the cardholder (Figures 1 and 3; column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 17-22; column 4, lines 13-19; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 5; column 5, lines 41-59).

Regarding claims 40 and 47, Simpson discloses wherein the card payment instrument account includes at least one of a credit card account, a stored value card account, a debit card account, and a multi-featured credit on a debit card account (column 1, lines 21-25 and 45-53; column 2, lines 29-49).

Regarding claims 41 and 48, Simpson discloses wherein the investment account includes at least one of a mutual fund account, a stock account, an individual retirement account, a 401(k) plan account, a savings account, a certificate of deposit account, a money market fund, and an employee stock purchase account (column 1, lines 21-25 and 45-53).

Regarding claims 42 and 49, Simpson discloses calculating the monetary reward amount each month as a percentage of net purchases in the card payment instrument account (column 1, lines 54-59; column 2, lines 50-66; column 4, lines 45-57; column 5, lines 25-30).

Regarding claims 43 and 50, Simpson discloses transferring the monetary reward amount to the investment account at least once a year (column 1, lines 54-59; column 2, lines 50-66; column 4, lines 45-57; column 5, lines 25-30).

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson, and further in view of Feidelson.

Regarding claim 53, Simpson discloses a computerized method for implementation of multiple accounts, wherein the multiple accounts include at least one

card payment instrument account from a card issuer and at least one investment account from a financial institution (columns 1-6), the method comprising:

Establishing a partnership between the financial institution providing the at least one investment account and the card issuer providing the at least one card payment instrument account for linking card instrument accounts with investments accounts (column 3, lines 51-64; column 5, lines 60-63);

Providing to a cardholder a card instrument (column 3, lines 55-60);

Providing an investment fund card application to an applicant, the investment fund card application entitling an approved cardholder to establish a card payment instrument account (column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 67);

Approving a submitted investment fund card application implementing an application processor system (column 3, line 55 - column 4, line 37);

Establishing the card payment instrument account through the card issuer for the approved cardholder upon approval, wherein the card payment instrument account includes a reward feature available to the cardholder (Figures 1 and 3; column 1, lines 10-25 and lines 45-63; column 2, lines 30-39; column 3, line 50-column 4, line 53; column 5, lines 25-28; column 6, lines 19-26);

Linking the card payment instrument account from the card issuer to the investment account from the financial institution (Figure 1; column 2, lines 30-41; column 4, lines 27-37; column 6, lines 19-27);

Establishing a reward structure through an agreement between the financial institution and the card issuer (column 1, lines 46-63; column 2, lines 9-11; column 5, lines 25-30);

Implementing the reward feature by tracking expenditures made through the card payment instrument account and calculating a monetary reward amount in relation to the tracked expenditures (Figure 3; column 1, lines 10-25 and lines 45-63; column 4, lines 45-53; column 5, lines 25-28);

Depositing the monetary reward amount generated by the reward feature into the investment account at a predetermined time interval (Figure 3; column 1, lines 45-63); and

Simpson does not disclose wherein the issued card payment instrument bears the name of the financial institution and the name of the card issuer. However, Feidelson discloses wherein the issued card payment instrument bears the name of the financial institution and the name of the card issuer (column 14, lines 38-42). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of a credit card wherein a reward feature is implemented through partnership with another organization as disclosed by Simpson to adapt issuing a credit card that bears partnership organizations on the card as disclosed by Feidelson. The motivation would be that co-branding a credit card by including the names of participating organizations on the card, rather than just one organization in the partnership, builds customer use in using the card by providing visual queues as to the benefit of the using the card. When a user is preparing to pay for a purchase and opens their wallet and sees, for example,

three credit cards, the credit card with a visual reminder that using that card will result in a deposit into one's investment account based on the purchase value will inspire the purchaser to select that card for the purchase over a card which offers no specific and tangible reward. Building loyalty and encouraging use is the motivation behind the use of co-branded credit cards.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant argues, regarding claims 37 and 44, that the cited references fail to disclose several features. Particularly, applicant argues that the references fail to disclose providing an investment fund card application to an applicant, where the application entitles an approved cardholder to establish a card payment instrument account and an investment account, approving the application, and establishing the card payment instrument account through the card issuer, wherein the card payment instrument account includes a reward feature; and an investment fund card application as one application. However, as detailed in the Office Action above, these features are taught by the combination of Simpson and Ogilvie. Simpson discloses the receipt of separate applications for a card payment instrument and an investment account, however, Ogilvie discloses applying for a payment card account and an investment account using a single application. The practice of filling out multiple applications for multiple services and/or products and the practice of filling out a single application for multiple services and/or practices are both old and well known. Simpson discloses the establishment of a partnership between the card issuer and financial institutions for

investment accounts, such that a reward feature can be implemented to fund such accounts as Roth IRAs, 401k's, a savings account, etc. Clearly two entities are involved, a credit card issuer and a financial institution. Simpson particularly states that the investment account and credit account are separate and distinct accounts, though linked, and that they may be held or serviced by different entities or the same entity.

Applicant also argues that Ogilvie fails to teach any deficiencies of the Simpson reference, particularly that Ogilvie deals with only one entity whereas the claims as presented recite a card issuer and a financial institution. As noted above, Simpson discloses the partnership of two entities. Similarly, Ogilvie discloses two entities. Ogilvie specifically discloses a card issuer and a savings vehicle provider (see Figures 2-3; column 4, lines 11-3 and column 6, lines 1-11). Ogilvie specifically discloses a card issuer and a financial institution involved in a system for offering rewards when a consumer uses a credit card, and Ogilvie further discloses that it is old and well known that a single application can be used for the establishment of a credit card and investment account as provided for in the rejection above.

Applicant further argues that none of the references teach a credit card bearing two names, those of the issuer and the financial institution. Both Simpson and Ogilvie disclose the partnering of a card issuer and a financial institution in offering a rewards program in which consumers can invest funds based on transactions using credit cards. Likewise, Feidelson discloses such a system. Additionally, as presented in the Office Action above, Feidelson also specifically discloses where a co-branded credit card between the administrator and a credit card issuer. It is disclosed at column 5, lines 31-

37 and column 6, lines 33-42 that the administrator is a broker/dealer associated with an investment fund. Therefore, Feidelson discloses a co-branded card between the card issuer and the financial institution (the broker/dealer managing the investment fund).

Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose creating the investment account in response to the acceptance when the card issuer notifies the financial institution to open an investment account upon approval and establishment of the card payment instrument account. However, examiner points to various sections in Simpson in which an investment account is opened upon approval of the card payment instrument account, and as discussed above, the credit card issuer and financial institution are separate entities maintaining separate and distinct accounts. As noted particularly at column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 5, the credit card account is first created, and then an investment account is created. Given that Simpson discloses that the investment account and credit account may be held or serviced or different entities or the same entity, it would be obvious that if the accounts were managed by different entities, that the credit card account would be created by the credit card issuer and then the investment account would be created by the financial institution managing the investment account, per the steps at column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 5.

Applicant additionally argues the application of cited case law, in re Venner. Applicant argues that since the manual activity was not taught by the prior art, that the use of in re Venner is irrelevant as the base art teaching has not been established. As detailed above, Examiner finds that the prior art of record teaches the limitations of

account opening, where the art is silent as to whether this happens manually or automatically. Examiner contends that even if the prior art intends for the function to be performed manually, it would be obvious to perform the function automatically given the case law of in re Venner.

Applicant argues that no motivation, teaching, or suggestion has been provided for arriving at the combination of features. However, examiner notes that for each combination presented in the Office Action above, proper combination and motivational statements have been provided. Further, the courts have stated that "A suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the relevant prior art teachings does not have to be found explicitly in the prior art, as the teaching, motivation, or suggestion may be implicit from the prior art as a whole, rather than expressly stated in the references... The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2000). However, rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. See Lee, 277 F.3d at 1343-46; Rouffett, 149 F.3d at 1355-59. This requirement is as much rooted in the Administrative Procedure Act, which ensures due process and non-arbitrary decisionmaking, as it is in § 103. See id. at 1344-45." In re Kahn, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (CA FC 2006). XXXXX "It is, of course, not necessary that either [prior art

references] actually suggest, expressly or in so many words, the changes or possible improvements appellant has made." In re Sheckler, 168 USPQ 716, 717 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Courts have stated that "[a] suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the relevant prior art teachings does not have to be found explicitly in the prior art, as the teaching, motivation, or suggestion may be implicit from the prior art as a whole, rather than expressly stated in the references...The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art... there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." In re Kahn, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (CA FC 2006). Examiner asserts that such "articulated reasoning" to support the legal conclusion of obviousness has been provided.

The Courts have stated that "[w]hen a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or a different one. If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation, §103 likely bars its patentability. For the same reason, if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond his or her skill." KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc. 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740, 92 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007).

In the instant case, the cited prior art references were available in the field at the time of the purported invention. The Applicant merely implemented a predictable variation of these existing methods in establishing his/her own invention. Such predicatability is based upon the fact that each incorporated method performs the same function and provides the same utility as originally intended in their pre-combination state.

## ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). The final is issued both as the arguments are not persuasive and based on a newly added claim.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached at 571-272-6702. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jennifer Liversedge/
Examiner, Art Unit 3692

/Kambiz Abdi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3692